

Mark's girlfriend simply turns his direction and states, unmoved and unemotionally, "Hmmm . . . déjà vu!" She doesn't mention it again for the rest of the day.

[0030] Mark may later test her, because he is, of course, amazed that she would not be emotionally affected by staring in the direction of a man who jumped to his death. For example, he may later state, "I wonder what all those police were on the bridge for today." She may reply that she had no idea, and was wondering the same thing herself. Alternatively, they may be watching the evening news when a news article explains the commotion on the bridge today. In one embodiment, Mark's girlfriend may incredulously exclaim to Mark, "Did you know there was a suicide jumper on the bridge today?" In another embodiment, the news article includes video footage of the shouts and pleas of the jumper and, in the background, Mark's car may be seen driving past. At this, Mark's girlfriend's eyes widen as she realizes that she was a firsthand witness to the event, but didn't even notice it. In another embodiment, she says "déjà vu" during the news article and does not seem to take notice of its content.

[0031] The next day, Mark shows up at Dr. Avery's office and explains to him what he observed. Of course, Mark is emotionally distraught by the observation of his girlfriend, believing that perhaps there is something psychologically wrong with her, or believing that there are magical, evil forces at work. Dr. Avery swears up and down that he does not know how or why Mark's girlfriend failed to notice the emotionally taxing event. However, Mark insists that Dr. Avery is among the best in the field, and has consistent (albeit often unconventional) solutions and explanations for problems that other psychologists only ponder. Mark begs Dr. Avery for help, realizing that it is a problem he can't face himself. Finally, Dr. Avery tells Mark to sit down, and he explains what he knows about déjà vu, particularly that description previously given above. For example, he explains that the mind may induce déjà vu by, perhaps, re-experiencing (i.e., "copying and pasting") the same sensations that a person just experienced, or perhaps experienced previously in the day, the year, or life in general. The mind may do so during or retroactively after an event which would, absent déjà vu, be very emotional taxing on a person, and/or be a reminder of a past traumatic event or experience.

[0032] Dr. Avery, who knows about Mark's past, explains how his past traumatic experience (of his mother being shot to death) could (but need not necessarily) cause Mark to experience déjà vu when any actual event occurs that might remind Mark of cause Mark to relive the past traumatic experience. Examples of such actual events may include, but are not limited to: hearing a loud bang that sounds like a gunshot; seeing a photo of his mother; seeing a series of Mother's Day cards at a drug store; Mark's girlfriend asking him to commit; seeing someone get shot in a fictional movie; and so forth. Dr. Avery explains that the more the actual event emulates the past traumatic experience, the more likely Mark will experience déjà vu during that actual event. Thus, he explains, it is almost certain that Mark would experience déjà vu in the unlikely event that Mark should ever witness a person being shot in real life. Before Mark leaves his office, Dr. Avery requests that Mark keep this advice to himself, as he asserts that he is concerned about his own reputation and does not want to further the industry's poor perception of his non-conventional ideas. Dr. Avery

also indicates that few others (if any) know about his theory of déjà vu. Mark understands and leaves.

[0033] Mark attempts to learn more about and test Dr. Avery's theory about déjà vu. For example, he may know about one or more past traumatic experience for each of his patients, and may attempt to arouse those memories with various words, objects, pictures, actions, and so forth, and ask them if and when they experienced déjà vu. He may do the same sort of experiments on himself and his girlfriend, with or without his girlfriend's knowledge. For example, he may take her for a walk on a steep hill, and pretend to accidentally slip, and subsequently ask her to see if she experienced déjà vu.

[0034] Later, Mark is again watching a television news program when a news clip updates him on the progress of the aforementioned murder case. A short video clip is shown of the suspect during her arrest during which she incoherently shouts phrases regarding her lack of memory, her confusion, her lack of a motive, and, most importantly, her déjà vu experience while the murder occurred. At this point, Mark is inspired, energized, and fearful by the realization that the suspect may not have committed the crime, and may have been a witness as someone else committed the crime. The suspect may then have involuntarily experienced déjà vu to mask the actual murder event. He immediately calls Dr. Avery, who does not pick up her phone, and leaves a hurried, excited, concerned message on Dr. Avery's voice-mail regarding the suspect.

[0035] Without further consideration, Mark immediately begins a several-day investigative quest in which he attempts to find out more information about the suspect. Eventually, through one or more means or method known in the art for portraying a character successfully investigation a question, Mark may come to several conclusions. (The various ways and creative methods in which a character in a story may successfully investigate a question, such as a question regarding another character, are well known in the art and within the scope of the present invention, and will not be discussed further here.) First, he may come to learn or believe that the suspect was never a perpetrator in the previously mentioned stabbing murder (the one occurring ten years prior, such as to a parent, sibling, or loved one); rather, she was an involuntary witness. The event was so gruesome and nauseating and traumatic that it became an event to which she would in the future experience déjà vu upon its reminder or recollection. Second, he may come to learn or believe that the rich, murdered man's widow began seeing a much younger man soon after his murder, and that she was, quite happily, the sole beneficiary of a multi-million-dollar life insurance policy.

[0036] Mark soon puts the pieces together. The suspect did not murder the man, nor had anything to do with the man. The widow, either herself or through an agent, murdered the man to collect the life insurance policy. More importantly, the man was openly murdered, by stabbing, with the suspect as the only witness. Why? The perpetrator must have known the truth about the suspect—namely, that she wasn't a murderer, but was an involuntary witness to a previous traumatizing stabbing murder, who would experience déjà vu if she ever witnessed something similar, and would not "snap out" of the déjà vu experience until after the event was mostly or completely over. The perpetrator knew that she